

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Donald McCrimmon,)	C.A. No. 4:09-2456-25AK
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
Mary M. Mitchell, Warden, FCI-Edgefield,)	
)	
Respondents.)	
_____)	

This action was filed by the petitioner, proceeding *pro se*, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. (Doc. # 1). This matter is now before the undersigned for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). In his Report, Magistrate Judge Rogers recommends that this action be dismissed without prejudice and without requiring the respondents to file a return. (Doc. # 15). The Report was filed on December 10, 2009. To date, no objections to the Report have been filed.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

A review of the record indicates that the Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 15), and this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without requiring the respondents to file a return.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
TERRY L. WOOTEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

January 26, 2010
Florence, South Carolina